



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,196	02/24/2004	Peter Gernold	13906-114001 / 2003P00306	9245
32864	7590	08/24/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			HARPER, LEON JONATHAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/784,196	GERNOLD, PETER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leon J. Harper	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/21/2006</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to application 10784196 filed on 2/24/2004.

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-6 are directed towards a computer readable medium or a propagated signal. A signal while incapable of being perceived or touch is also incapable of providing a tangible result, thus the directing of claims 1-6 to a propagated signal make the claims non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 2166

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6505200 (hereinafter Ims) in view of US 5884324 (hereinafter Chen).

As for claim 1 Ims discloses: access information identifying a type of data to be distributed to data sites (See column 10 lines 23-27); access information identifying a distribution criterion that defines the basis upon which the type of data is to be distributed to the data sites (See column 10 lines 35-30); access application data of various data types (See column 13 lines 35-40);

While Wan does not differ substantially from the claimed invention the disclosure of generate data subscriptions in a network of distributed computer systems operating an application program having the application data of the various data types, wherein each data subscription 1) is generated based on the type of data to be distributed to data sites and the distribution criterion and 2) identifies a portion of the application data to be distributed to one or more of the data sites is not necessarily explicit. Chen however does disclose generate data subscriptions in a network of distributed computer systems operating an application program having the application data of the various data types (See column 3 lines 48-50), wherein each data subscription 1) is generated

based on the type of data to be distributed to data sites and the distribution criterion (See column 3 lines 60-65) and 2) identifies a portion of the application data to be distributed to one or more of the data sites (See column 3 lines 62-67 note: if selected). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teachings of Chen into the system of lms. The modification would have been obvious because subscriptions closely resemble the client server model which the preferred model of data sharing (See lms column 1 lines 49-54).

As for claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Chen discloses wherein the one or more code segments are further configured to: access information related to data sites wherein the data site information includes attributes and attribute values associated with a particular data site (See column 3 lines 45-50); and associate a particular data site with a particular data subscription based on the data site information being related to the portion of application data to be distributed in the particular data subscription (See column 3 lines 59-64).

As for claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Chen discloses: wherein the type of data to be distributed to data sites comprises a business object type (See column 1 lines 29-33).

As for claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Chen discloses: wherein the type of data to be distributed to data sites comprises a

publication (See column 4 lines 20-26 note: any database available is published).

As for claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Chen discloses: wherein: the distribution criterion comprises an attribute of the type of data to be distributed, and the generation of data subscriptions comprises generating data subscriptions wherein each data subscription is generated based on the attribute of the type of data to be distributed to data sites (See column 3 lines 46-50).

As for claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Chen discloses: wherein: the distribution criterion comprises a distribution criterion based on a relationship of a portion of the application data with an employee that uses a data site (See column 4 lines 14-17 authorization is a relationship), and the generation of data subscriptions comprises generating data subscriptions wherein each data subscription is generated based on the relationship of the portion of the application data with the employee that uses the data site (See column 3 lines 55-60 note: if the user is not authorized then no subscription is generated).

Claims 7-14 are system claims containing substantially the same limitations as the computer readable medium claims 1-6 and are thus rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-6.

Claims 15-20 are method claims corresponding to computer readable medium claims 1-6 and are thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claims 1-6.

Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon J. Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-0759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 4:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LJH
Leon J. Harper
August 21, 2006


MOHAMMAD ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER